

THE UNPUBLISHED¹ TATTVASIDDHI OF ŚĀNTARAKṢITA:

A RÉSUMÉ

Śāntarakṣita (8th C.A.D.) and his works need no introduction to Tibetologists in general and to Tibetan scholars in particular. He is held very highly by Tibetan scholars and monks and is adored as the Mahāpaṇḍita Bodhisattva (= *mkhyan-chen-byan-chub-sems-dpañ*). He is also credited for initiating monkhood in Tibet, for establishing rules for translating Sanskrit texts into Tibetan and also for founding a Buddhist monastery in bSam-yas².

After the discovery and identification of his *Tattvasaṅgraha* and its commentary by his devoted disciple Kamalaśīla³, he has not remained unknown even to the Sanskritists. All of his works⁴

1. It is learnt that Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasiddhi* (Sanskrit-Tibetan) was in 'the course of elaboration' under the editorship of Prof. Christian Lindtner of Denmark, but I could not know whether the work has been published or not. See *Sanskrit Studies outside India*, Delhi, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sanstha-na, 1981, p. 17.

2. S. C. VIDYĀBHUSANA, *A History of Indian Logic*, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1971, p. 323.

3. (i) Prof. B. Bhattacharya, GOS XXX, XXXVI, 1926.

(ii) Also Ch. XVIII, *Anumānaparikṣā* only with com. of Kamalaśīla and Tibetan and Sanskrit Kārikās by A. Kunst, 1939.

(iii) English translation of text and commentary by Gaṅgānāth Jhā. GOS, Nos. LXXX, LXXXIII.

4. The (eleven) titles are ascribed to Śāntarakṣita and they are available in the *Bstan-ḥgyur* as follows:

(i) *Śrīvajradhara-saṅgīta-bhagavat-stotra-ṭīkā-ka* 231b-237a⁵. Tohoku catalogue No. 1163.

are extant in Tibetan translation, while a few⁵ are available in Sanskrit version also. The *Tattvasiddhi* of the Ācārya, found in Tibetan as well as in Sanskrit, requires full appreciation as it could not appear in Sanskrit so far, consequently it could not reach the hands of the non-tibetan scholars easily. On the basis of a Ms. Prof. Benoytosh Bhattacharya has shed a little light on it in the Foreword of his *Tattvasaṅgraha* (Gaekwad Oriental Series XXX, Foreword pp. xxi-xxiii, 1926), but that is quite inadequate for any detailed purpose.

I collected as many as six manuscripts in Sanskrit, some of them in old and new Newārī characters and some in the Devanāgarī script. The source of all of them has been, in one way or the other, Nepal. One manuscript was procured from the microfiche plates prepared by the Institute of Advanced Studies for World Religions (MBB. II-248) and the other from the Oriental Library, Baroda and rest are from the private collections of Nepālī Paṇḍits. To my wonder the readings of all the manuscripts, like any other manuscript procured from Nepālī sources, are so corrupt that it has been quite impossible to trace out any sensible meaning of the text throughout from Sanskrit manuscripts. Not only letters, syl-

-
- (ii) *Hevajrodbhava-Kurukullāyāh-pañcamahopadeśa-Ta242b⁷ -243b⁵*, T.C. S.No. 1316.
 - (iii) *Tattvasiddhināmaprakaraṇam-Tsu. 26b¹-39a²* T.C. S.No. 3708.
 - (iv) *Satyadvayavibhāṅga-pañjikā-Sa 15b²-52b⁷* T.C. S.No. 3883.
Tāranātha differs: *Bauddha dharma kā itihāsa*, Patna, KPJR1, 1971, p. 113.
 - (v) *Madhyamakālaṅkārikā-Sa 53a-56b³* T.C. S.No. 3884.
 - (vi) *Madhyamakālaṅkāra-vṛtti. Sa 56b⁴-84a¹*. T.C. S.No. 3885.
 - (vii) *Tattvasaṅgrahakārikā-Ze 1b¹-133a⁶*, T.C. S.No. 4266.
 - (viii) *Samvaraviṃśakavṛtti-Hi-167a⁴-184b³*. T.C. S.No. 4082.
 - (ix) *Vādanyāyavṛtti-vipañcitārthā-Sha. 51a²-151a⁴* T.C. S.No. 4239.
 - (x) *Aṣṭatahāga-stotra-Ka 238a⁴-239a⁴*, T.C. S.No. 1166.
 - (xi) *Bodhyāpattideśanāvṛtti-it* is not available in Tohoku catalogue. See D. T. SUZUKI, *The Tibetan Tripitaka (Peking Edition) Catalogue and Index*, Tokyo 1962, S.No. 5506b. It is to note that this text was translated into Tibetan from Sanskrit by the Ācārya, it was not composed by him.

5. *Tattvasaṅgrahakārikā* (see note 3) and *Vādanyāyavṛttivipañcitārthā*.

lables and words but even the sentences are found missing from one manuscript or the other. As soon as one step is put forward, *Varṇa-Viparyayas* and *Varṇa-Vyatyayas* create successive hindrances. They are so frequent, rather occurring in almost every word, that sometimes the words sound irksome to the ear and leave the editor to guess their proper forms. Even if a word is guessed in its proper form, one is not free to use it without any authenticity. Almost every editor⁶ of any Sanskrit text working on the manuscripts from Nepālī sources, has undergone the same difficulty, as I have been facing. It is surprising that manuscripts of Sanskrit on palm leaves or hand made paper or birch-bark recovered from Tibetan monasteries by Mahāpaṇḍita Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, have been found correct to a large extent. Ultimately I collated and compared the text and deciphered the words with the Tibetan translation of the treatise preserved in the *Bstan-hgyur*⁷. After a lot of hard labour a presscopy of the text in Devanāgarī character has been prepared and is running through the press, yet it can not be boasted that it is fully correct.

The treatise begins with a salutation in prose to Śrī Vajrasattva, the remover of all the blemishes. This part actually constitutes the text, is doubtful. Though not rare, yet this prose line seems to be interpolated by the copier of the manuscript and not by the author himself, as the readings of this part differ from one manuscript to the other. The other Sanskrit manuscript reads *namaḥ sarvajñāya* instead of *vajrasattvāya* and the Tibetan version reads « salutation to Kumārabhūta Mañjuśrī ». This is a common practice among the copiers of particularly the religious and philosophical texts to bow down to their favourite deities and also put it down on the paper before beginning the text to write. Same is the case with the colophon also. The readings of the colophon of

6. Prof. P. L. Vaidya and Bagachi have described the corruptness of Nepālī manuscripts in the Introductions of all the works edited by them in the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts Series, Darbhanga.

7. I am highly thankful to most Ven. Prof. S. Rinpoche, Principal of our Institute for kindly guiding me in collating and deciphering the text with Tibetan translation.

the text differ very much in different manuscripts⁸. A copier, owing to his superfluous faith in the author and his work, adds attributes to them from his own side. Though there are instances that the authors held themselves very highly, and boasted their own talents, yet the majority of them has been humble and has narrated the subject in a very simple way.

Afterwards the work begins with a benedictory verse in which the author salutes the Vajrayāna which, according to him, is the source of the *sukha* of the *Mahāsukha*. He resolved to start the text so that delusion (*sammoha*) may be averted. In the long following passage, the superiority of the Vajrayāna has been described in an elegant poetic diction where the author confirms that the *Mahāsukha*, which is indential with Vajrasattvahood, can be attained in this very life without much exertion by following the Vajrayāna, while it is rarely approachable to the followers of other paths in many lives. He also assures that, whatever he treats in the text, is based on the *yuktis* (= logic) and *āgama* (= scripture).

Śāntarakṣita propounds further the doctrines of particular effects (= *viśiṣṭa-phala*) from a particular group of causes, the *kāraṇasāmagrīvāda* and the *vyāpya-vyāpakabhāva*, instrumentality of *citta* with *prajñā* and *upāya* for everything, attainment of the ultimate reality by a person with the firm *bodhicitta* though always indulged into *kāma* etc., attainment of the ultimate reality through true knowledge of the elements (= *tattvas*), proving *ātmaparigraha* the foremost cause of defilement and not the objects (= *viśayas*) by nature, emergence of reverse effects through repeated meditation (= *bhāvanābhyāsa*), only when objects (= *viśayas*) are not taken always as the cause of delusion and attachment (= *rūgahe-tus*), causation of the supreme goal (= *anuttaraphala*) from a particular transference through *trimaṇḍalapariśuddhi*, evidence from the *Ratnakūṭasūtras* that objects conditioned by *mantra* and *mu-*

-
8. (i) *Ācāryaśāntarakṣitapādakṛtaṃ Tattvasiddhiprakaraṇaṃ samāptaṃ* (from Tibetan version).
 - (ii) *Tattvasiddhināmaprakaraṇaṃ samāptaṃ. Kṛtirācārya-Śāntarakṣitapādasyāśeṣaparasiদ্ধāntasāgarapārasya.*
 - (iii) *Tattvasiddhināma-prakaraṇaṃ samāptaṃ.* One of the manuscripts adds the oft quoted lines in the end of the text i.e. *Ye dharmā-hetuprabhavā ... mahāśramaṇaḥ.*

drā lead to supreme goal, proper knowledge of *dharma-nairātmya* causes the supreme and highest bliss (= *anuttaramahāsukha*), non-capability of the strictest vows (= *kṛcchravrata*) and harshest penances (= *duścaratapa*) for producing the supreme bliss (= *mahāsukha*), unfit persons for enjoying the objects, treatment of Tantricism owing to a certain purpose, difference in consumations between a deluded and an enlightened, description of the vows and practices of *yogis* (= *yogivatras*), penances of the *yogis*, obtaining *mahāsukha* through *sukhabhoga* (= consumption of pleasure) and not through *kṛcchratapa*, possibilities of mutual purification of opposites through meditation, non-return to worldliness of the persons after attaining highest perfection, attainment of goodness (= *śubhaprāpti*) through contrary-meditation, hypothesis of voidness (= *śūnyatā*) that any sprout emerges up neither from the destruction nor from the non-destruction of a seed showing that the use of the words destruction and non-destruction is mere *vyavahāra*, *saṃvṛti*, *māyā* etc., and not the ultimate reality, utility of *savikalpaka jñāna* is for meditation etc. not for ultimate truth (= *paramārtha*), dependence of the knowledge according to the theory of dependent origination (= *pratītyasamutpāda*), discussions on the definition of *savikalpaka*, theory and process of attaining knowledge, methods leading to the ultimate goal of meditation.

Thus it is quite clear that *Sāntarakṣita* in *Tattvasiddhi* has established the *Tattvas* (= the main fundamentals) of *Buddhism*, logically on the compact and firm syllogistic pattern. As his style is mainly expository, he affirms all the points using every organ of syllogism i.e. major, middle, minor terms etc., employs *anvaya* and *vyatireka vidhis*, and the *Svabhāva*, *Kārya* and *Anupalambha hetus* where applicable and necessary. He also deals with, as shown earlier *anātmavāda*, *saṃskāravāda*, *pratītyasamutpāda*, *śūnyatā*, *bodhicittotpāda* etc., which are the basic fundamentals of Buddhist philosophy. Though he does not repudiate nor condemn doctrines of the opposite sects, systems or cults, yet they are indirectly eradicated themselves. Establishing *anātmavāda* means condemnation of *ātmavāda* of the *Naiyāyikas*, *Vedāntists* etc. Affirmation of *saṃskāravāda* stands face to face with *nityaśuddhivādin* i.e. *Vedāntins*. *Pratītyasamutpāda* and *kāraṇasāmagrīvāda* are opposite to *nityekakāraṇavāda* of the philosophers of the theistic group. There is no

comparison in the technique and style of the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and *Tattvasiddhi*, the style of the former is repudiatory while that of the later is expository. In his *Tattvasaṅgraha* the author repudiates some major philosophical doctrines of the non-buddhist schools as Śrīharṣa (12th C.A.D.) adopts the style in his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍa-khāḍya* to condemn the non-vedāntic schools. In these works it is hardly guessed what the propositions of the author are. Quite contrary to the former Śāntarakṣita in his *Tattvasiddhi* only apologizes for the pre-established fundamentals of the school. From the commentary of Kamalaśīla at a few places only the expository points of Śāntarakṣita may be guessed but not directly from the *kārikās* of *Tattvasaṅgraha*.

It is also very difficult to trace out from the *Tattvasaṅgraha* what sect of Buddhism Śāntarakṣita belonged to, but it is very clear from his *Tattvasiddhi* that he practised the Vajrayāna methods and rituals for realization. The three main points that help to mark the difference between a Buddhist *Tāntrika* text from that of a non-buddhist one, are *bodhicittotpāda*, *śūnyatā* and *sarvalokamāṅgalabhāvanā*. All these points have been dealt with in the *Tattvasiddhi* very elaborately. His exhaustive treatment of *śūnyatā* confirms that he was a convinced *śūnyavādī* and belonged to the *Madhyamaka* school. The fact that he was a *Svātantric* is also revealed from the Tibetan translation of his *Madhyamakālāṅkāra*⁹, its auto-commentary and their Tibetan commentaries written by the native scholars. Tibetan traditions also declare that he not only belonged to the *Mādhyamika* school but to the *Yogācāra* subcult of its *Svātantrika* sect¹⁰. Even among the sections of the *Yogācāra-svātantrika-mādhyamika* cult of Vajrayāna, his line of practice was *mahāsukhavādī*. At many places he highlights the Vajrayāna and the *mahāsukhavāda* in the text. His faith in the *vajrayānī* practices is also supported by a few of his other works. *Śrī-vajra-dhara-saṅgīta-bhāgavat-stotra-tīkā*, *Hevajrodbhava-kurukulāyāṇ pañca-*

9. *Sems.tsam.la.ni.brtten.nes.su/khyi.rol.lānos.med.shes.par.byā / tsul.hdi.brtten.nes.de.la.yaṅ / Shin.tu.bdag.med.shes.par.byā //* *dbu.ma.rgyan*, Sarnath, 1976, p. 17.

10. His Holiness the XIVth DALAI LAMA, *Bauddhasiddhāntasāra* (Hindī), Dharamsala, Council of Religious Affairs of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, 1964, p. 4.

mahopadeśa, *Samvaraviṣṭakavṛtti* and *Bodhyāpattideśanāvṛtti* prove that he had not only an inclination but also all favours for the Tantric rituals and their practices. Thus the text of the *Tattvasiddhi* and other works of Śāntarakṣita preserved in Tibetan translations prove him to be a *Tantrika* of the *Vajrayāna-mahāsukhavāda* sect.

Tattvasiddhi is a work that deals with the philosophical bases of Vajrayāna Tantricism and not the methods of performing rituals. It is also important to note here that the remarks on the cover-page of the manuscript of the *Tattvasiddhi* preserved in the microfiche plate form prepared by the Institute of Advanced Studies of World Religions, New York (LMhJ. 000,406,¼, MBB II-248) that « this is very important logic book, discussing on *Prajñā* », are not correct. *Tattvasiddhi* is not a work of logic but is a work composed on logical syllogistic pattern and not mainly but just by the way deals with not only *prajñā* but also *upāya*. It must be clear that the *nayas* of the *prajñā-pāramitā* and the *mahāsukhavādī* method of the Vajrayāna are quite different. Both are similar in the sense that both are the Buddhist ways of realization. However, such faulty remarks on the covers of such texts that are difficult to be read correctly on account of corrupt readings and renderings are quite obvious and need to be ignored. Such inaccuracies also happen when the cataloguers are not competent enough and also not conversant with the subject matter of the texts of uncommon philosophical sects.

In this little treatise Śāntarakṣita includes the names of persons like Sugata, Subhūti, Mahāvīra, Bhagavān, Nāgārjuna, Dharmakīrtipāda, Tathāgata, Āryadeva and Kaśyapa and quotes from the *sūtras* like the *Upāliparipṛcchā*, *Jinajananī*, *Ratnakūṭa*, *Laṅkāvatāra* and *Vairocanābhisambuddhi* and *tantras* like *Sarvadevasa-māgamatantra*, *Sarvakalpa-samuccaya-tantra*, *Samvaratantra*, *Śrīguhyasamāja*, *Śrīparamādyā*, *Vimuktisamudyātanatantra*, *Laukikalokottaratantra*, *Mūlatantra* and *Guhyendutilaka*. He also quotes from the *Catuśśatakam*, *Kāśyapaparivarta*, *Nirupamastava* (name not cited but traced out), *Śīlapaṭala*, *Guṇaparyantastotra* of Ratnādāsa (name not cited but traced), *Laukikapramāṇaparīkṣā* topic of Dharmakīrti and the *Bodhicarvāvatāra* also. There are several prose

and verse quotations whose sources have neither been cited by the author nor could be traced out by me from the huge bulk of the *Bstan-hgyur* and *Bkaḥ-hgyur* and allied texts.

Including the benedictory verse, there are as many as eighty seven quotations in verse and five in prose forms from various sources. Several verses have been partly quoted in Sanskrit manuscripts while at the same time they are available in full in the Tibetan versions. Such portions have been restored into Sanskrit from the Tibetan translations. Many missing quotations too, have been restored into Sanskrit from the Tibetan version and added to the text at proper places accordingly. The names of a few *tantras* like *Vimuktisamudyātana*, *Laṅkāloṭkottaravajra* and *Sarvadevasamāgama* are neither heard in the Tibetan *Bkaḥ-hgyur* or *Bstan-hgyur* nor in the catalogues of the non-Buddhist *Tantrika* texts, but Śāntarakṣita quotes from them frequently. They might be extant those days.

Thus this short compendium of the Ācārya provides a firm and authoritative footing to the philosophy of the Vajrayāna *Tantrika* discipline and also floods light on Śāntarakṣita's that aspect of life which might be related to his private religious practices.